



WASHINGTON
COURTS

Washington State Court Improvement Program Strategic Plan 2015-2016

The well being of children depends on all of us...



Overall Goal/Mission of CIP:

Improve outcomes for children and families in the child welfare system by increasing collaborative efforts of courts and child welfare partners.

Washington State Court Improvement Program Steering Committee Members

Co-Chairs:

Judge Anne Hirsch, Thurston County Superior Court

Commissioner Michelle Ressa, Spokane County Superior Court

Members:

Ken Emmil, Special Assistant, Foster Care Education Student Support, OSPI

Carrie Hoon Wayno, Assistant Attorney General

Phil Jans, Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators

Kathy Jensen, Attorney, Northwest Justice Project

Judge Barbara Mack, King County Superior Court

Jill Malat, Washington State Office of Civil Legal Aid

Joanne Moore, Director, Washington State Office of Public Defense

Ron Murphy, Senior Director of Strategic Consulting, Casey Family Programs

Ryan Murrey, Acting Director, Washington State Court Appointed Special Advocates

Judge Kathryn Nelson, Pierce County Superior Court

Toni Sebastian, Director of Program and Policy, Children's Administration

Shannon Thomas, Staff Attorney, Kalispel Tribe of Indians

CIP Team:

Cindy Bricker, CIP Director

Dr. Carl McCurley, Manager, Washington State Center for Court Research

Matt Orme, Senior Research Associate, Washington State Center for Court Research

Catherine Pickard, Senior Research Associate, Washington State Center for Court Research

Kelly Warner-King, Co-Director, Court Improvement Training Academy

Rob Wyman, Co-Director, Court Improvement Training Academy

Introduction

The Court Improvement Program (CIP) Steering Committee met on March 18, 2015 and reviewed the mission statement and principles for decision making, the status of recent CIP projects, statewide dependency performance data, and the CIP budget outlook. Children's Administration discussed collaboration between child welfare agencies and the courts regarding the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). A request was made for the CIP Steering Committee to provide oversight of the Washington State funded Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP). Using information gathered from these activities, the committee identified and prioritized target areas for change.

The CIP Director met with the committee co-chairs and the CIP data and training team to further develop the plan of action and budget based on input from the steering committee. This strategic plan reflects how the Court Improvement Program plans to move forward to improve the dependency process in Washington State.

Members of the CIP Team, a child welfare representative, judicial officer, and law enforcement officer participated in the national CIP meeting focused on child trafficking. A plan was developed for addressing this issue in Washington State and is included in the CIP Strategic Plan.

Three new areas of focus are:

- CIP team will participate with Children's Administration meetings to improve permanency planning and prepare for the Child and Family Services Review.
- Form an FJCIP Oversight Committee that reports to the CIP Steering Committee to provide continuous quality improvement for the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program.
- Plan for improving awareness of and local procedures for addressing the trafficking of children.

The Washington State Court Improvement Program staff will continue to improve working relationships with the Children's Administration and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to improve policies and processes around child welfare, including a focus on the Child and Family Services Review. Efforts will also continue in training judicial officers and court partners, supporting the Foster Youth and Alumni Summit to give youth a meaningful voice, and supporting the Parent for Parent program to increase reunification. An increased effort will be made to improve relationships between state and tribal courts as we work together on Indian child welfare.

Two objectives from the 2014 Strategic Plan have been removed, as they are now incorporated within the work of the Permanency CQI workgroup, co-sponsored by the Children's Administration and Administrative Office of the Courts. The objectives were: 1) Increase the

percentage of children who achieve permanency within 15 months; and 2) Increase percentage of cases with adoption completed within 6 months of termination. The goal of the multi-disciplinary workgroup is to increase the number of children achieving timely reunification/permanency.

This strategic plan will be the guide by which the Washington State CIP will allocate grant funding and other resources towards improving outcomes for children and families in the child welfare system.

Outcome #1: Timely, thorough and complete court hearings

Need Driving Activities:

- Dependency and termination of parental rights (TPR) filings continue to increase in Washington State. A total of 5,067 dependency cases were filed in 2014. Across the 2013-2014 period, termination filings increased by 11.5% to 2,021. While improvements have been made with regard to: reducing time to fact-finding, cases reaching permanency before 15 months of out-of-home care, and adoptions within six months of the termination order; our rate of compliance decreased in 2014 in the areas of six-month review hearings, permanency planning hearings, and TPR petitions filed within 15 months. In an effort to increase the number of children achieving timely reunification/permanency, the CIP Director is co-leading, along with Children's Administration, a team of multi-disciplinary stakeholders to review data, identify targets for performance improvement, and work in a collaborative effort with the stakeholders in areas where improvements are needed.
- Permanency outcomes for children in out-of-home care in Washington State are strongly affected by the actions of the dependency courts and the child welfare system. AOC and Children's Administration have jointly established a program to investigate barriers to permanency in both systems, sharing administrative data to review performance and discuss practice improvements. In 2012 the annual dependency timeliness report (DTR) included a section on disproportionality and index ratio. The 2013 DTR included a technical report that examined court process timeliness and its relationship with permanency related outcomes. The 2014 DTR included an easier-to-read synopsis and key findings from the technical report. These efforts show continuous quality improvement as a result of data sharing and analysis. Further work is needed to improve data linking between Famlink and SCOMIS systems which will improve the precision of estimates and potentially include the ability to analyze data regarding Evidence Based Practices (EBP). The next research and analysis focus will be on the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Programs, described below, to measure the impact of these programs on family and juvenile cases.
- In 2008 the Washington State Legislature passed a bill establishing the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) and provided grant funding for 16 counties to participate. Emphasis was placed on the principle of One Family/One Team, specific training for judicial officers, longer judicial rotations in family and juvenile courts, early mediation, and case management. FJCIP Coordinators were hired for each participating county to coordinate cases. Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR) was tasked with measuring performance of FJCIP courts using the Dependency Timeliness Report. Data shows that FJCIP courts exceed performance compared to non-FJCIP courts in timeliness measures. FJCIP coordinators also use the interactive dependency timeliness report (IDTR), which is updated monthly, to track their

dependency cases. Because each FJCIP court is unique, there is a need to conduct a more extensive evaluation of the FJCIP programs to determine how the specific operational enhancements improved outcomes for children and families.

In March 2015, the CIP Steering Committee was asked to provide oversight of the FJCIP courts in order to provide guidance for continuous quality improvement of the program. The CIP Committee agreed to fulfill the need for oversight. FJCIP expenditures have been used as the match for the CIP grants for several years. The FJCIP Oversight Committee has recently been formed and will have its first meeting in September 2015. The CIP Director is now overseeing implementation of the state grant funds for the FJCIP programs.

A new effort the FJCIP courts will be involved in is the One Family One Team public/private partnership. In 2015, the legislature budgeted \$75,000 with a match by a private foundation, to plan and design a grant pilot program with a focus on early resolution interventions in dependency cases. This is an opportunity for the courts to build on the work of the FJCIP courts. The FJCIP Oversight Committee will keep the CIP Director and Steering Committee informed as the project progresses.

Data Sources:

Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes 2014 Annual Report:

<http://www.courts.wa.gov/wscsr/docs/DTR2014.pdf>

[RCW 2.56.230](#) – Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Grant Program

Strategic Category: X Capacity Building X Court Function Improvement X Systemic Reform

Measurable Objective #1	Increase the number of children achieving timely reunification/permanency.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIP team will participate in the Permanency CQI workgroup hosted by Children’s Administration. • Use data to identify issues and engage counties with low percentage of children achieving permanency to work with local partners on solutions. • Identify counties with high percentage of children achieving permanency and evaluate their process. • FJCIP Oversight Committee will review data regarding FJCIP courts on a quarterly basis to evaluate and consider further activities.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Training, Data, and Basic
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	CIP Director, WSCCR data analyst, CITA, Children’s Administration, and dependency court partners, and FJCIP Oversight Committee.
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	Ongoing.
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Areas for improvement will be identified and work will begin with local stakeholders to develop solutions.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Increased percentage of children achieving timely permanency.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	FamLink, SCOMIS, and IDTR.
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	All of the collaborative partners listed above will be informed throughout the process and monthly data updates will be provided through the IDTR to show progress. The FJCIP Oversight Committee will review data regarding FJCIP Courts on a quarterly basis. The CIP Steering Committee will review data annually to evaluate and consider further activities to address improvements based on need.

Measurable Objective #2	Provide oversight of the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Programs
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<p>FJCIP Oversight Committee will review FJCIP program reports and assist in design of corrective action when necessary. Stay current on research about best practices and provide training and program assistance.</p>
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	<p>Basic/Data/Training</p>
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	<p>FJCIP Oversight Committee: FJCIP Chief Judges, Supervisors and Coordinators, CIP Director, CASA, CITA, and WSCCR.</p>
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	<p>Continual court improvement based on developing strategies of best practices.</p>
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	<p>FJCIP courts will improve their timeliness measures reported in the Dependency Timeliness Report.</p>
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	<p>Quarterly and annual reports provided by each FJCIP court. Interactive Dependency Timeliness Report provided by WSCCR.</p>
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	<p>An annual report will be prepared about the FJCIP program and presented to the FJCIP Chief Judges, Supervisors and Coordinators, Superior Court Judges' Association-Family and Juvenile Law Committee (SJCA-FJLC), CASA, CITA, WSCCR, legislators, and CIP Steering Committee.</p>

Measurable Objective #3	Improve permanency outcomes for children in out-of-home care
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<p>WSCCR and the Department of Social and Health Services Research and Data Analysis Division (DSHS-RDA) will continue to investigate barriers to permanency in dependency courts and the child welfare system by sharing administrative data, researching processes and outcomes, and providing technical reports. This year will focus on evaluation of FJCIP court operations to measure the impact on family and juvenile cases.</p>
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	<p>Data</p>
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	<p>WSCCR, DSHS-RDA, Casey Family Programs, Children’s Administration, SCJA-FJLC, CIP Steering Committee, FJCIP Oversight Committee, FJCIP chief judges, supervisors and coordinators, and Commission on Children in Foster Care (CCFC).</p>
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i></p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical reports that will assist the courts and Children’s Administration in reviewing performance with the goal of improving practice. • Improved data linking between FamLink and SCOMIS.
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	<p>Once permanency barriers have been identified and addressed, there will be an expectation of increased rates of compliance with timeliness measures and decreased rates of re-entry to the foster care system.</p>
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	<p>FamLink, SCOMIS</p>
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	<p>Technical reports will be shared with Children’s Administration, SCJA-FJLC, CIP Steering Committee, FJCIP Oversight Committee, and the CCFC. Presentations will occur at meetings of those organizations to prompt discussion of next steps for making system improvements based upon findings. Findings will also be included in the <i>Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes</i> report which is provided to the Washington State legislature.</p>

Outcome #2: High quality legal representation for parents, children and Children's Administration.

Need Driving Activities:

- Parents Representation: The Washington State Office of Public Defense (OPD) Parents Representation Program (PRP) provides state-funded attorney representation and case support services to indigent parents, custodians, and legal guardians involved in child dependency and termination of parental rights proceedings. Key elements of the PRP include: the implementation of case load limits and professional attorney standards; access to expert services and independent social workers; OPD oversight; and ongoing training and support. In 2013, the legislature appropriated an additional \$3.4 million to implement the program in more counties, and also provided funding to assist with Children's Administration's permanency initiative. The program operates in 31 of Washington's 39 counties. Since its inception, the PRP has been evaluated numerous times showing positive results. In a recent evaluation of the program, the PRP's enhanced legal representation was shown to reduce the days to establishing permanency for children in foster care by speeding up reunification with parents, or where reunification was not possible by speeding up permanency through guardianship or adoption. This program is operating well with continued funding from the Washington State legislature and will not be an area of focus for the CIP, other than providing funding for continued education.
- Children's Representation: Under current Washington State law, the court must appoint a guardian ad litem (GAL) for a child in a dependency unless the court finds the appointment unnecessary. In many counties, court appointed special advocates (CASAs) are assigned to recommend what is in the best interest of the child. Legislation passed in the 2014 session requires the appointment of an attorney to represent a child in a dependency proceeding six months after granting a petition to terminate the parental rights and there is no remaining parent with parental rights. E2SSB 6126 (Chapter 108, Laws of 2014), was signed into law March 28, 2014, and requires the state to pay the costs of legal services as long as counsel meets certain standards. A court may appoint an attorney for children at any time in a dependency action on its own initiative or upon the request of a parent, child, GAL, caregiver, or the DSHS. The Office of Civil Legal Aid is responsible for implementation and administration, including verifying attorneys are providing representation in accordance with the standards of practice and training recommended by the Statewide Children's Representation Workgroup. There is a need for funding for child representation attorneys to continue education on issues relating to children in foster care.

- **Children’s Administration Representation:** Children’s Administration (CA) is represented by the Attorney General’s Office (AGO), a statewide office, in 33 of the 39 counties in Washington. In the remaining six counties the AGO contracts with local prosecutor’s offices or private attorneys to represent the local CA office. The AGO represents CA case workers in dependency, termination, and guardianship cases, as well as contested adoptions, records challenges, and administrative appeals in foster care, childcare licensing cases and child abuse and neglect appeals. The AGO also represents CA in appeals of these cases in both the Court of Appeals, and the state Supreme Court. Statewide there are about 90 attorney FTEs devoted to this work within the AGO. Assistant Attorneys General, deputy prosecutors and private attorneys who represent CA participate in quarterly training regarding juvenile litigation matters, and other trainings as available. These attorneys also provide legal training to CA social workers both locally, and at the statewide level. In 2013 the legislature appropriated \$2.5 million for anticipated AGO legal services related to the permanency initiative. This supplementary allocation of resources resulted in the addition of temporary attorneys and support staff who are working to litigate termination cases across the state. In the 2015 legislation session, the legislature appropriated \$1,990,000 to continue the Permanency Initiative for 18 months of the 15-17 biennium.
- To gain competence and requisite knowledge to effectively handle dependency and termination cases, judges and attorneys must be educated in a variety of specialized topics. Local, expansive and inexpensive training opportunities are relatively rare for many jurisdictions. The Children’s Justice Conference affords judicial officers and attorneys an opportunity to receive education on topics as diverse as childhood development, effects of trauma, substance abuse treatment, judicial leadership, ICWA issues, increasing father’s involvement, and racial and ethnic disparity. CIP funding supports judicial and FJCIP attendance at the CJC. A recent survey of juvenile court judicial officers revealed that a small percentage of judicial officers had attended the Child Abuse and Neglect Institute sponsored by NCJFCJ. There is a need for resources for judicial officers to attend CANI, or to have NCJFCJ provide CANI training in Washington State.

Data Sources:

Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes 2014 Annual Report:

<http://www.courts.wa.gov/wscct/docs/DTR2014.pdf>

Office of Public Defense website: www.opd.wa.gov

Mark E. Courtney & Jennifer L. Hook, Evaluation of the impact of enhanced parental legal representation on the timing of permanency outcomes for children in foster care, Children and Youth Services Review 34, 1337-1343 (2012)

[RCW.13.34.100](#) – Appointment of guardian ad litem

[ESSB 6126](#) – Dependency Proceedings—Representation of Children

Children’s Justice Conference: <http://www.dshscjc.com>

Strategic Category: X Capacity Building X Court Function Improvement X Systemic Reform

<p>Measurable Objective #1</p>	<p>Improve understanding of local dependency court system.</p>
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITA will work with Children’s Justice Conference (CJC) organizers to develop a legal track for the conference focusing on issues of interest to judicial officers, attorneys, CASAs, and GALs and providing legal training for non-attorneys on child welfare legal issues. CIP funds will pay for registration and travel expenses for judicial officers and Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) Coordinators to attend the CJC. • CIP funds will pay for a number of scholarships for judicial officers to attend the Child Abuse and Neglect Institute (CANI) and/or arrange for NCJFCJ to provide training in Washington.
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	<p>Training and Basic</p>
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	<p>Judicial officers, Office of Public Defense, Attorney General’s Office, Children’s Administration, Office of Civil Legal Aid, Guardians ad Litem, CASAs, CITA and NCJFCJ.</p>
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	<p>Provide judicial officers and attorneys with high quality education about dependency and termination legal issues, child development, substance abuse, trauma, domestic violence, trafficking, parental engagement and involvement, etc.</p>
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	<p>Maintain current level of CJC attendance by judicial officers and FJCIP Coordinators. Increase number of judicial officers receiving CANI training.</p>
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	<p>Timeliness measures, captured in FamLink and SCOMIS will continue to improve with appropriate and consistent judicial education.</p>
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	<p>CJC evaluations are completed by attendees, including requests for future session topics and shared with the Children’s Justice Task Force (CJTF), for which CIP Director serves as consultant. CJTF analyzes evaluations for future session topics and consultants. Feedback will be shared with the SCJA-FJLC, CIP Steering Committee, and FJCIP Oversight Committee to receive comments and suggestions for future CJs. Attendees of CANI will be surveyed and results will be shared with the CIP Steering Committee to evaluate further investment in CANI training.</p>

Outcome #3: Engagement of the entire family in child welfare proceedings

Need Driving Activities:

- Parents for Parents (P4P) is a peer outreach and education program provided by parents who have successfully navigated the juvenile dependency court system to parents who have recently become engaged with the dependency system. The program provides early outreach and education about the dependency program through a parent-led Dependency 101 class. The program increases parental court participation and compliance with court orders. P4P programs have used CIP funds for program start-up, with continued funding coming from various sources. In some counties the program is administered by the Superior Court; however in other counties the program is administered by other agencies. In both instances there is strong collaboration with the court system.

P4P programs are currently active in the following counties: Grays Harbor, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane, and Thurston/Mason. Whatcom County is in the beginning stages of implementation. Process and outcome evaluations performed by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) of the King County P4P Program, found that participating in the P4P program and attending Dependency 101 training resulted in increased compliance with case plans and visitation, and participants had a greater rate of reunification and lower rate of termination of parental rights compared to non-participants. Due to the success of the P4P programs, the model was used to develop P4P programs in four other counties, using CIP funds. Other counties in Washington State could benefit from this successful intervention. The goal is to implement this program statewide as funding becomes available.

The biggest challenge of the P4P programs has been funding the programs beyond initial implementation. In 2015 the Washington State Legislature passed 2SSB5486 and provided funding for the existing P4P programs, as well as an appropriation to cover an evaluation during the second year funding cycle. The Office of Public Defense will administer the funds as a pass-through to a nonprofit organization to provide administration of the program. The legislation requires a preliminary report to the legislature be provided by December 1, 2016. The preliminary report must include statistics showing rates of attendance at court hearings and compliance with court-ordered services and visitation. The report must also address whether participation in the program affected participants' overall understanding of the dependency court process. A subsequent report must be delivered to the legislature by December 1, 2019. In addition to the information required in the preliminary report, this report must include statistics demonstrating the effect of the program on reunification rates and lengths of time families were engaged in the dependency court system before achieving permanency. State funding has been provided for the second evaluation/report, but not for the first year. CIP funding has been requested to assist with the evaluation required for the preliminary report in order to fill the

funding gap and meet the evaluation requirements, which also aligns with the CIP goal of continuous quality improvement (CQI).

- The courts need a system with reliable, fast and inexpensive paternity test results which will allow fathers to engage earlier in the dependency processes. Research shows nonresident fathers who are engaged early in the dependency process are more likely to become involved fathers. Nonresident fathers' involvement with their children is associated with a higher likelihood of a reunification outcome and lower likelihood of an adoption outcome. Children with highly involved nonresident fathers are also discharged from foster care more quickly than those with less or no involvement. A father's involvement is also associated with children's well-being and with lower levels of behavior problems. Not resolving paternity early in dependency cases increases costs associated with assigning counsel, as well as costs for evaluations and remedial services and publication costs. Additionally, stakeholders might not be as open to engaging alleged fathers (some counties may not offer services until paternity is established or may not be as focused on engaging alleged fathers until they know they are the biological father) and fathers maybe less receptive to the process because they are not interested in participating unless they are the biological parent. Additionally relative placement exploration is delayed, potentially increasing foster care cost and delaying a placement where the child might be more comfortable with family. Timely resolution of paternity issues is both in the best interests of the child and essential to avoiding delays at subsequent points in the court process.

Data Sources:

Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes 2014 Annual Report:

<http://www.courts.wa.gov/wsccl/docs/DTR2014.pdf>

Duarte, "King County Model Court Final Report", p. 5, October 17, 2013

[2SSB 5486](#) – 2015 legislation creating the Parents for Parents Program

Harris, Leslie Joan. "[Involving Nonresident Fathers in Dependency Cases: New Efforts, New Problems, New Solutions.](#)" *Journal of Family Studies* 9, 2007, 281, 307.

Henry Chen, Karin Malm, & Erica Zielewski, [More about the Dads: Exploring Associations between Non-resident Father Involvement and Child Welfare Case Outcomes.](#) (2008), available at

Office on Child Abuse and Neglect, U.S. Children's Bureau Rosenberg, Jeffrey, Wilcox, W. Bradford, [The Importance of Fathers in the Healthy Development of Children](#) (2006)

[National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Adoption Guidelines](#), 2000.

Strategic Category: X Capacity Building X Court Function Improvement X Systemic Reform

Measurable Objective #1	Increase reunification
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<p>Catalyst for Kids will continue support of implementation of the Parents for Parents (P4P) program in Whatcom County. CIP funds will support the evaluation required for the preliminary report regarding all P4P programs to the legislature due December 1, 2016.</p>
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	<p>Basic</p>
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	<p>Counties with P4P Programs, Office of Public Defense, Catalyst for Kids, Parent Allies, CIP Director.</p>
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i></p>	<p>12/1/16</p>
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	<p>P4P program will be set up in Whatcom County with trained parent allies and leadership teams. A preliminary report on the P4P program will be provided to the legislature.</p>
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	<p>With successful P4P in Whatcom County, data should indicate increased compliance with court-ordered service plans, increase in parents' compliance with court-ordered visitation at the review hearing. Qualitative data should indicate that parents are more educated in the juvenile dependency system than without P4P, parental anxiety is reduced about the dependency process, and parental perceptions of CPS are improved. The preliminary report should provide the legislature an evaluation of all P4P programs that will support our anecdotal evaluation that this program works and will consider funding the statewide expansion of the P4P program.</p>
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	<p>FamLink, SCOMIS, case reviews, surveys.</p>
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	<p>Parents, judicial officers, CASAs, CA caseworkers, AAGs, parents' attorneys, and P4P staff, including parent allies, will receive surveys as to the effectiveness of the P4P. Answers to the survey will be conveyed to the P4P leadership team for consideration and appropriate implementation. The preliminary report to the legislature will also be shared with the P4P programs, CIP Steering Committee, Superior Court Judges Association Family and Juvenile Law Committee and the Commission on Children in Foster Care.</p>

Measurable Objective #2	Early establishment of biological paternity to facilitate engagement of paternal family
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	Clark, Cowlitz, Snohomish and Thurston Counties will continue pilot projects and Pierce County will implement a new pilot project to significantly reduce the time to determine paternity in dependency and termination cases. Each court will provide low-cost, easily accessible, and rapid DNA testing to alleged fathers.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	Courts in Cowlitz, Clark, Pierce, Snohomish and Thurston Counties, CASAs, Office of Public Defense, LabCorp, CIP Director
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i>	9/30/16
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Early identification of the biological father increases opportunities for the child to engage with relatives and decreases time to permanency.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Provide the system with reliable, fast and inexpensive paternity test results which will allow fathers to engage earlier in the dependency process. Early identification and engagement of fathers will enable courts to better meet dependency timelines, reduce costs associated with multiple alleged-fathers and foster care costs associated with delayed relative placements, reunification and permanency planning. Prior to implementation of the project, each court will track the time to receive a paternity test result and continue to gather data after the project begins. Implementing the project is anticipated to greatly reduce the number of days to determine paternity.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	SCOMIS
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	Results from the pilot project will be shared with the collaborative partners listed above, along with the CIP Steering Committee, SCJA-FJLC, Commission on Children in Foster Care, and juvenile court partners throughout Washington State to determine if this project should be replicated statewide.

Outcome #4: Physical, social and emotional well-being needs of children and youth

Need Driving Activities & Data Source:

- The Commission on Children in Foster Care supports the annual Foster Youth and Alumni Leadership Summit, where foster youth are given a voice and an opportunity to exchange concerns, challenges and suggestions for foster care system improvements. Policymakers, advocates and community members work alongside youth to address the proposed reforms. Several legislative and policy reforms have been implemented based upon proposals from past summits. The summit is funded by contributions from Casey Family Programs, Center for Children and Youth Justice, Children's Administration and CIP grant funds. Funding is needed in order for the Mockingbird Society to continue to host this event as a form of continuous quality improvement in the foster care system.
- To gain competence and requisite knowledge to effectively handle dependency and termination cases, judges and attorneys must be educated in a variety of specialized topics. Local, expansive and inexpensive training opportunities are relatively rare for many jurisdictions. The Children's Justice Conference affords judicial officers and attorneys an opportunity to receive education on topics as diverse as childhood development, effects of trauma, substance abuse treatment, domestic violence, child abuse, homeless youth, and racial disparity and disproportionality. CITA provides dependency training to judicial officers twice per year which includes these topics, and they have invited foster youth to share their important stories as part of the presentation. Funding is needed to pay for facilities, presenters, registration and travel expenses for judicial officers to attend. Funding is also needed for judicial officers to attend the Child Abuse and Neglect Institute sponsored by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), possibly bring NCJFCJ training to Washington, and for parent and children attorneys to attend their respective American Bar Association conferences.
- Youth involved with either the child welfare or juvenile justice system are often identified as a high-risk population who are in need of services and intervention programs. Recent studies have shown that contact with the child welfare system was associated with offender referrals at a younger age, longer time spent in detention, more serious offending, greater likelihood of repeat offending, and involvement in sex trafficking. The Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR) has started a data analysis project regarding youth involved in both the child welfare and the juvenile justice systems. The multi-system youth project is funded by CIP and is an extension of the Doorways to Delinquency project previously funded by the MacArthur Foundation in King County. The study will be expanded by WSCCR to include youth statewide, in order to increase the understanding of risk factors and behavioral aspects that characterize multi-system youth and families. This will enable process reform and improve collaboration for multi-system youth. The Multi-System Collaboration and Coordination Policy Reform Workgroup (MCSS), a WSCCR

partner, is actively working on issues related to youth in both systems. Funding is needed to pay for the WSCCR data analyst position (.5 FTE).

- The Becca Task Force is a multidisciplinary state-wide collaboration of educators, court administrators, judicial officers, attorneys, treatment providers, law enforcement and legislators. The task force mission is to help keep youth engaged in school, on the path of educational success and out of the juvenile offender system. Washington State Becca laws and processes provide a second line of defense to reinforce the well-being outcomes of families and children involved in the child welfare system. Data suggest that children and families with a history of child welfare involvement may need additional supports, beyond what is currently being offered by the child welfare system, to keep children engaged in school, out of the juvenile justice system, and on track to future success. Funding is needed to pay for a portion of a staff position to coordinate the research and training functions of the Becca Task Force, including planning for the annual Becca Conference.
- The 2015 National CIP Meeting focused on the problem of human sex trafficking and how the courts, child welfare agencies, law enforcement and other partners will need to work together to implement the anti-trafficking provision of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act of 2014. The Washington CIP Team that attended the meeting consisted of a judicial officer, child welfare representative, law enforcement representative, CIP director, CITA co-director, and court research analyst. The CIP Team developed a plan for improving awareness of and local procedures for addressing the trafficking of children. A statewide assessment of all stakeholders is needed to determine the level of knowledge of trafficking and what local practices exist in each area of the state in order to best assess next steps.
- The Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) identifies well-being, along with safety and permanency, as one of the three key outcomes for children. Since courts are responsible for ensuring the state is providing proper care to children in its custody, courts need to consider whether the children are receiving a quality education and are physically and emotionally healthy. Child-well-being measures and indicators need to be developed to evaluate court and child welfare system performance.

Data Sources:

Mockingbird Society: <http://www.mockingbirdsociety.org/>

Children's Justice Conference: <http://www.dshscjc.com/>

University of Washington Court Improvement Training Academy: <http://www.uwcita.org/>

National Center for Juvenile Justice. Halemba, Gregory and Siegel, Gene. *Doorways to Delinquency: Multi-System Involvement of Delinquent Youth in King County (Seattle, WA)*

WSCCR, Pickard, Catherine, *Prevalence and Characteristics of Multi-System Youth in Washington State*. April, 2014.

Pickard, C. (July, 2015). Multi-System Youth In Washington State Prevalence By Jurisdiction.

Washington State Center for Court Research. DRAFT

[Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act of 2014](#)

[Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997](#)

Strategic Category: X Capacity Building X Court Function Improvement X Systemic Reform

Measurable Objective #1	Give youth a meaningful voice at both policy and practice level.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIP funds will assist the Mockingbird Society with hosting the annual Foster Youth and Alumni Leadership Summit where youth are able to articulate their thoughts and ideas for improving the foster care system. • CITA will invite foster youth to participate as presenters in training sessions for judicial officers and encourage local dependency teams to invite foster youth representatives to participate in Tables of Ten.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic, Training
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	Mockingbird Society youth chapters and leadership, Commission on Children in Foster Care, Casey Family Programs, Center for Children and Youth Justice, Children’s Administration, CIP Director, CITA, and Tables of Ten dependency teams.
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	Ongoing.
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Policymakers, advocates and community members will work alongside youth to address proposed reforms. Judicial officers and other child welfare partners will have a better understanding of the needs of foster youth as they share their stories in a training environment.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Foster youth feel they have been heard. Policies and laws are changed to improve physical, social and well-being needs of youth in foster care.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	Annual newsletter produced by Mockingbird Society.
Feedback Vehicle Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.	A summit report is produced by Mockingbird Society to memorialize the proposals presented at the youth summit. This report is shared with CCFC, legislators, and child welfare partners. Changes made in policy and legislation as a result of the proposals are reported in the annual Mockingbird Society newsletter. CITA training attendees will evaluate the impact of the youth participation and share thoughts with CITA and CIP Director.

Measurable Objective #2	Increase judicial officer and other court partners awareness of physical, social and emotional well-being needs of children and youth.
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIP funds will support attendance of judicial officers and Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) Coordinators to the Children’s Justice Conference (CJC), semi-annual CITA sponsored dependency trainings, and Child Abuse and Neglect Institute (CANI). Support attendance of parent and child attorneys as funds are available. • CIP Director will inform judicial officers, FJCIP Coordinators, and attorneys of other trainings/webinars/educational literature that become available on relevant topics.
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	Basic and Training.
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	CITA, Children’s Administration, CIP Director, state and tribal judicial officers, FJCIP Coordinators, Office of Public Defense, Office of Civil Legal Aid.
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i></p>	Ongoing.
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	Provide judicial officers, FJCIP Coordinators and attorneys with high quality education through the CJC and CITA dependency training about childhood development, effects of trauma, substance abuse treatment, domestic violence, child abuse, homeless youth, trafficking, and racial and ethnic disparity, etc.
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	Timeliness measures will continue to improve with appropriate and consistent judicial education.
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	FamLink and SCOMIS
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	CJC evaluations are completed by attendees, including requests for future session topics and shared with the Children’s Justice Task Force (CJTF), for which CIP Director serves as consultant. CJTF analyzes evaluations for future session topics to verify and plan for identified needed training. Feedback will be shared with the SCJA-FJLC and CIP Steering Committee to receive comments and suggestions for future CJs. CIP Director also works in conjunction with CITA regarding the semi-annual dependency training sessions.

Measurable Objective #3	Determine the risks and needs of multi-system youth.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	WSCCR will gather and analyze data to provide descriptions at the county-level of characteristics and outcomes of youth involved in more than one system, i.e. Children’s Administration, dependency courts, and juvenile justice systems.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Data
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	WSCCR, Children’s Administration, Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA), CCFC, courts, FJCIP, SCJA-FJLC, and Multisystem Collaboration and Coordination Workgroup
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	Ongoing
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Provide local level information for stakeholders to better understand the increased risk level and have information needed to reduce overlap, negative outcomes and improve treatment services to youth and families. Review how case handling systems overlap to develop the means for creating a more efficient and family friendly juvenile system.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Establish baseline for future tracking.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	FamLink, SCOMIS, JCS
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	Reports and presentations will be given to courts, Children’s Administration, CASA, WAJCA, CCFC, FJCIP, SCJA-FJLC, and Becca Task Force. The report to the courts will be shared with members of the Washington State legislature.

Measurable Objective #4	Keep foster youth engaged in school and out of the juvenile justice system.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	CIP funds will partially support a staff position to coordinate the research and training functions of the Becca Task Force, including planning for the annual Becca Conference.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	CIP Director, Becca Task Force, Center for Children and Youth Justice, SCJA Family and Juvenile Law Committee, and WAJCA.
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i>	09/30/2016
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Improved engagement in school and increased collaboration between educators, court administrators, judicial officers, attorneys, treatment providers, law enforcement and legislators.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Increase school attendance and reduce juvenile justice involvement of foster youth.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	FamLink, SCOMIS, JCS, Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS)
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	Becca Task Force staff will work with the WSCCR Multi-system Research Analyst to coordinate research efforts and share information through presentations to the CIP Steering Committee, SCJA FJLC, Becca Task Force, Center for Children and Youth Justice, SCJA Family and Juvenile Law Committee, and WAJCA.

Measurable Objective #5	Improve awareness of and local procedures for addressing the trafficking of children.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	CIP trafficking team will assess state for knowledge of trafficking and local practices.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	CIP, Children’s Administration, judicial officers, law enforcement, WSCCR, tribal courts, attorneys, juvenile court administrators, community services, schools, mental health providers, etc.
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	3/31/16
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Comprehensive report describing available local resources and practices around trafficking of youth and areas where improvements are necessary to increase knowledge, implement appropriate practices and improve availability of resources.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Improve knowledge in order to develop next steps.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	Surveys completed by leadership, middle management and line staff of the agencies listed in Collaborative Partners, above.
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	The comprehensive report will be shared with legislators, CIP Steering Committee, Statewide CSEC Task Force, CCFC, SCJA-FJLC, WAJCA, and survey participants. Meetings will be held to discuss next steps, which will be included in the next strategic plan.

Measurable Objective #6	Develop child well-being indicators in the dependency system.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	WSSCCR and the Department of Social and Health Services Research and Data Analysis Division (DSHS-RDA) will work together to develop well-being indicators in dependency courts and the child welfare system by sharing administrative data and researching processes and outcomes.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Data
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	WSSCCR, DSHS-RDA, Casey Family Programs, Children’s Administration, SCJA-FJLC, CIP Steering Committee, Commission on Children in Foster Care (CCFC)
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	Ongoing.
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical reports that will identify well-being indicators that can be used by dependency courts and Children’s Administration in reviewing performance and discussing practice improvements. • Improved data linking between FamLink and SCOMIS.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Once the well-being indicators have been identified, courts and CA staff will have the ability to better measure well-being of the children in foster care.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	FamLink, SCOMIS
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	Technical reports will be shared with Children’s Administration, SCJA-FJLC, CIP Steering Committee and the CCFC. Presentations will occur at meetings of those organizations to prompt discussion of next steps for making system improvements based upon findings. Findings will also be included in the <i>Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes</i> report which is provided to the Washington State legislature.

Outcome #5: Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) compliance

Need Driving Activities

- At the 55th Washington Judicial Conference in 2013, tribal court judges, state court judges, and others gathered to discuss the potential for establishing a tribal-state court forum to facilitate collaboration between tribal and state courts in Washington State. Chief Justice Barbara Madsen and Justice Jane Smith welcomed the participants and reminded them of Court Rule 82.5, which was passed in 1995 to clarify jurisdictional issues and improve services to the members of our communities. A facilitated discussion was held on the importance of developing relationships and building trust in order to lay the foundation for tackling larger, more complex efforts. Participants identified a variety of specific issues and concerns that are in need of solutions locally where there is shared jurisdiction. Addressing these issues on a statewide basis would provide more uniformity and consistency in the approaches taken and provide the opportunity for evaluating the outcome of judicial practice in cross-jurisdictional areas. The second meeting of the Tribal/State Court Consortium was held in September, 2014. A presentation on ICWA was provided by a tribal judge and a state court commissioner. In the future, regional meetings will be held for tribal and state court judicial officers to work more closely to develop relationships and work on issues between their jurisdictions. To provide support and continuity, the CIP Director should continue to be involved in the consortium efforts both on a statewide and regional basis to further promote collaboration between tribal and state courts.
- The Court Improvement Training Academy (CITA) facilitated dependency training with a focus on the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) in December 2014 at the Port Madison Indian Reservation. Nine tribal court judges and seven state court judicial officers participated in discussions about the differences between state and tribal dependency courts. Relationships were developed between tribal and state court judges and interest expressed in joining the Tribal/State Court Consortium. Several tribal judges also attended the June dependency training and are very interested in future state court trainings. CITA also partnered with the Suquamish Nation and other entities to develop a one-day training focused on issues of significance to the Native American community related to child welfare. Tribal court judges should continue to be invited to state court dependency trainings to further the development of relationships between tribal and state court judicial officers and promote understanding of and collaboration between each system.
- A major development in tribal child welfare policy was announced in February 2015 by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), revising the *Guidelines for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings* for the first time since 1979. The new guidelines are intended to address some of the issues that states and public and private agencies have grappled with for the past 36 years. More

recently, the BIA distributed proposed rules, which will change the regulations for State Courts and agencies in Indian child custody proceedings. The BIA is currently considering public comments and the rules have not yet been finalized. Many of the proposed rules are already codified in Washington Law under our state ICWA. When guidelines were released, CIP Director forwarded them onto judicial officers. Once the rules become final, it will be important to educate judicial officers and staff regarding the new rules.

Data Sources:

Tribal and State Court Dialogue: Interest in a Tribal-State Court Consortium in Washington. September 2013.

[Guidelines for State Courts and Agencies in Indian Child Custody Proceedings.](#) Bureau of Indian Affairs. February 25, 2015

Strategic Category: Capacity Building Court Function Improvement Systemic Reform

Measurable Objective #1	Improve relationships between Tribal Courts and State Courts.
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	CIP Director will continue participating in the Washington State Tribal/State Court Consortium, promote Indian child welfare as a component of the consortium, and work with Tribal and State Court judicial officers on developing collaborative relationships.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	Judicial officers from tribal and state courts, CIP Director, Washington State Minority and Justice Commission and Gender and Justice Commission, CCFC, and SCJA-FJLC.
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i>	Ongoing.
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Improved relationships between tribal courts and state courts.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	Improve ICWA compliance. Improved services to families.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	FamLink, SCOMIS
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	CCFC, SCJA-FJLC, Minority and Justice Commission, Gender and Justice Commission will receive progress reports regarding the collaborative efforts and provide feedback regarding methodologies.

Measurable Objective #2	Train judicial officers on new ICWA regulations.
<p>Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i></p>	<p>CITA will include discussion of new ICWA guidelines in the Tribal-State Indian Child Welfare Judicial Roundtable in December 2015. CIP Director will work with CITA on providing information to judicial officers and court partners regarding the new ICWA regulations once they are finalized.</p>
<p>CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i></p>	<p>Basic.</p>
<p>Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i></p>	<p>CIP Director, CITA, Tribal and state court judicial officers, Office of Public Defense, Attorney General's Office, FJCIP Coordinators, CASAs, and Children's Administration.</p>
<p>Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or "ongoing"</i></p>	<p>December 2016.</p>
<p>Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i></p>	<p>Judicial officers will be better informed regarding ICWA.</p>
<p>Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i></p>	<p>Compliance with ICWA will increase and with increased compliance, reduction in disproportionality. Relationships between the tribes and state court will improve.</p>
<p>Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i></p>	<p>FamLink and SCOMIS</p>
<p>Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i></p>	<p>CIP Director will work with judicial officers through SCJA FJLC and CIP Steering Committee to determine further needs for training on the new ICWA regulations.</p>

Outcome #6: Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) work

Need Driving Activities:

When children are placed out-of-state, they are entitled to the same protections and services they would receive if they remained in Washington. The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) provides a statutory means to ensure that children placed in another state have a suitable place to live and have access to the appropriate services. Washington State would like to know how to determine if it is in compliance with ICPC and procedures used by other states.

Data Source:

[Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children](#)

Strategic Category: Capacity Building Court Function Improvement Systemic Reform

Measurable Objective #1	Determine if Washington State is in compliance with ICPC
Activity or Project Description <i>Specific actions or project that will be completed to produce specific outputs and demonstrate progress toward the outcome.</i>	CIP Director will request technical assistance to better understand ICPC coordination, how different states operate, and what compliance with ICPC means.
CIP Funding Stream <i>Grant(s) used to fund activity.</i>	Basic.
Collaborative Partners <i>Responsible parties and partners involved</i>	Children’s Bureau technical assistance, CIP Director, CIP Steering Committee, SCJA FJLC, CITA
Timeframe <i>Proposed completion date or “ongoing”</i>	Ongoing. Not a priority—only as time and resources allow.
Anticipated Outputs and Results of Activity <i>What the CIP intends to produce, provide or accomplish through the activity.</i>	Better understand ICPC compliance to determine if this is an area CIP needs to focus on.
Target Improvement <i>Provide specific, projected change in data the CIP intends to achieve.</i>	To be determined.
Data Source <i>Specific sources where data will be drawn to measure anticipated changes due to activity</i>	See comment above.
Feedback Vehicle <i>Stakeholders the data will be shared with and methodology/products for dissemination.</i>	Information gathered will be shared with the CIP Steering Committee, SCJA FJLC and CITA to determine if further steps need to be taken.